

**REMARKS**

**I. Introduction**

Claims 11 and 20 have been amended. With the addition of claims 22 to 26, claims 11 to 26 are currently pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

**II. Rejection of Claims 11 to 21 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 11 to 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as assertedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,194,114 (“Schneiderman”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0005030 (“Sutton”). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Schneiderman and Sutton does not render obvious any of claims 11 to 21, and the rejection should be withdrawn, for at least the following reasons.

Claim 11 has been amended herein without prejudice to recite:

sensing, by sensors, objects to be classified over a period of time;

**repeatedly classifying the objects**, by a computer processor, using specific quality parameters for each object class, wherein each classification uses quality parameters that are calculated from a separate instance of sensor data obtained over the period of time by the sensors;

**increasing**, by the processor, a value of a confidence parameter of an object class, the confidence parameter being calculated from the quality parameters and the increasing being conditional upon a subsequent one of the classifications confirming a result of a previous one of the classifications;

**decreasing**, by the processor, the value of the confidence parameter of an object class, the decreasing being conditional upon a subsequent one of the classifications failing to confirm the result of a previous one of the classifications; and

generating, by the processor, a final classification result including the confidence parameters that have been increased or decreased in value.

Accordingly, claim 11 provides that the **repeated classification** uses quality parameters calculated from separate instances of the sensor data that was **obtained over a period of time**. The Examiner agrees that Schneiderman does not disclose sensing objects to be classified over a period of time. It therefore follows that any recited features that refer to the repeated classification over the period of time are also not disclosed by Schneiderman. In

particular, the steps of **increasing** and **decreasing** are conditional upon a subsequent classification, respectively, confirming or failing to confirm the results of a previous classification over the period of time. Therefore, the steps of increasing and decreasing, as provided for in the context of claim 11, are not disclosed by Schneiderman.

The cited sections of Schneiderman also fail to disclose increasing and decreasing of a **confidence parameter**. Fig. 13 of Schneiderman refers to a method for assigning weights to training examples and therefore has nothing to do with the recited confidence parameter of claim 11, which is calculated from quality parameters that are in turn calculated from separate instances of *sensor data obtained over a period of time*, i.e., actual data rather than training data.

The asserted increasing step (160) in Fig. 16 of Schneiderman refers to incrementing a counter variable *i*, which is used to scale a image being searched. Therefore, step 160 is completely unrelated to **increasing confidence parameters**.

Additionally, with respect to the reference in the Office Action to col. 26, lines 14 to 19, neither of referenced Figs. 13 and 16 relate to the subject matter of col. 26, lines 14 to 19, which section refers to a threshold for total log-likelihood at each stage of sub-classifier evaluation. For example, it is unclear how the threshold relates to the asserted confidence in a training example referred to in Fig. 13.

Sutton does not cure (nor has it been asserted to cure) the deficiencies of Schneiderman pointed out above. Accordingly, the combination of Schneiderman and Sutton does not render obvious claim 11 or any of its dependent claims 12 to 19.

Claim 20 relates to a computer-assisted vehicle information system and includes subject matter analogous to that of claim 11. Accordingly claim 20 and its dependent claim 21 are allowable for at least essentially the same reasons as claim 11.

Withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claims 11 to 21 is therefore respectfully requested.

### **III. New claims 22 to 26**

Claims 22 to 26 do not add new matter. Claims 22 to 26 ultimately depend from claim 11 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 11. In addition, claims 22 to 26 recite additional features that are not disclosed or suggested by the applied references.

**IV. Conclusion**

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 5, 2010

/Aaron Grunberger/  
By Aaron Grunberger (Reg. No. 59,210) for:  
Gerard A. Messina (Reg. No. 35,952)

KENYON & KENYON LLP  
One Broadway  
New York, New York 10004  
(212) 425-7200

**CUSTOMER NO. 26646**